DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 380 TM 004 879

AUTHOR	Johnson, Lary
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Minneapolis Public Schools' 1973-74 Tuesday Released Time Program. Part I: A Summary of Findings.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	C-73-27
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	55p.; For related documents, see ED 084 285 and 296
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Elementary Secondary Education; Human Relations Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; Principals; *Program Evaluation; *Released Time; School Schedules; Staff Improvement; *Staff Meetings; *Teacher Attitudes; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis); *Tuesday Released Time Program

ABSTRACT

During the 1973-74 school year, elementary and secondary students in Minneapolis were released from their classes every Tuesday at 2:00 to allow staff members to participate in staff development activities. A variety of different types of meetings were distributed throughout the 37-week schedule: building meetings, citywide meetings, curriculum meetings, human relations meetings, etc. This report summarizes the overall findings. An evaluation strategy was developed with two major considerations. First, it would provide a vehicle for systematic planning and documentation of released time meetings. Second, it would provide outcome measures of released time benefits in addition to surveys of staff opinions. The evaluation strategy proceeded through five steps: needs assessment, objective setting, activity planning, process evaluation, and outcome evaluation. Evaluation findings indicated that many positive activities occurred during the Tuesday Released Time Program and that the participants had generally favorable views of the program. Several recommendations for improvement are given. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Research and Evaluation

ED113380

TM004 879

Educational Services

Minneapolis Public Schools

BOARD OF EDUCATION

W. Harry Davis, Chairman

Frank E. Adams	Mrs. Marilyn A. Borea	Philip A. Olson
Richard F. Allen	John M. Mason	David W. Preus

Superintendent of Schools

John B. Davis, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Special School District No. 1

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

ISC—Publications 19

ED113380

Minneapolis Public Schools

An Evaluation of the Minneapolis Public Schools' 1973-74 Tuesday Released Time Program
Part I: A Summary of Findings

Lary Johnson

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

July 1974
C-73-27

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413

Minneapolis Public Schools

An Evaluation of the Minneapolis Public Schools'
1973-74 Tuesday Released Time Program
Part I: A Summary of Findings

Summary

See page

During the 1973-74 school year elementary and secondary students in Minneapolis were released from their classes every Tuesday at 2:00 to allow staff members to participate in staff development activities. A variety of different types of meetings were distributed throughout the 37-week schedule: building meetings to be used by individual schools, citywide meetings organized by consultants, curriculum meetings organized by areas and consultants, human relations meetings, area meetings organized by decentralized areas, and at the elementary level, required and optional parent-teacher conferences. This part of the evaluation report summarizes the overall findings. Descriptions of objectives, activities, and specific evaluations for consultants and individual schools can be found in Parts II-V of the complete evaluation report: Part II (Citywide), Part III (East Area), Part IV (North Area), Part V (West Area). 1,2

Although there was great variation among schools, elementary staff members made good use of building Tuesdays. Staff questionnaires showed that parent-teacher conferences, faculty meetings to discuss school policies and procedures, staff meetings about program and curriculum development, meetings to learn about other educational programs, and desegregation-integration program planning were common uses of building Tuesdays. The majority of the staff members said they helped set objectives, helped plan the activities, and felt the activities were related to their individual needs. 5,6

Fifty-seven percent of the elementary staff said the building activities were very worthwhile, 39% said they were somewhat worthwhile, and 4% said they were of little or no worth. Ninety-four percent said the released time program should be continued, although 36% said some changes should be made. 7-9

Interviews with principals and staff members at ten elementary schools indicated that staff response was favorable and that building-designated released time periods had been used productively in most of these schools. 10-13

Building released time activities at most secondary schools were of some value to the staff members, although the evidence is not strongly favorable and substantial room for improvement exists. Compared with elementary school personnel, secondary personnel expressed substantially less favorable opinions of the building released time activities. The most common uses of secondary released time were faculty meetings to discuss matters such as school policies, procedures, budget, and program planning, and department meetings to work on program development or things such as budget and equipment orders. 14,15

Although there was substantial variation among schools, secondary staff members indicated a rather limited involvement in planning their activities. Overall, one-third of the staff said they helped set building released time objectives, while 11% said they helped plan many and 43% said they helped plan some of the released time activities. Thirty-two percent of the questionnaire respondents said the building activities were very worthwhile, 58% said they were somewhat worthwhile, and 10% said they were of little or no worth. 16-19

Many of the Area and Curriculum Tuesdays were given to the Human Relations Program or to individual schools. However, the consultants and area curriculum generalists did organize some staff development meetings on the Curriculum Tuesdays. 23-25

The subject-area and support-service consultants were responsible for three citywide meetings and several area-wide curriculum meetings. Although participant response to the consultant meetings differed substantially among subject and supportive areas, the overall participant reaction tended to be positive, but somewhat less favorable than their ratings of building released time activities. About one-third of the participants said the consultant released time activities were usually related to their needs, 39% said sometimes, and 25% said seldom. Overall, one-fourth of the respondents said the activities were very worthwhile, about half said they were somewhat worthwhile, and one-fourth said they were of little or no worth. 26-31

Five Tuesdays in each school were used for human relations activities. Although the evidence indicated room for improvement, particularly at secondary locations, the majority of the elementary participants and about half of the secondary participants felt the program had a positive impact on interpersonal relationships among staff members and on awareness of other cultural/ethnic groups. 31-36

Several recommendations were made. In abbreviated form, these recommendations were: 35,37,38

- More time should be devoted to planning and organizing released time activities that are related to the needs of the participants.
- More released time Tuesdays should be designated as the responsibility of individual schools.
- Citywide and Curriculum Tuesdays need a different structure and should be more related to the needs of the participants.
- Efforts should be made to improve the building activities at the secondary level.
- A statement of program guidelines should be made by the central and/or area administrations.
- Persons responsibile for each component of the released time program (school, consultants, area) should take the responsibility for building an evaluation component into its released time plans.

* * *

Table of Contents

	Page
Part I: A Summary of Findings.	1
Evaluation Design.	1
Tuesday Released Time Schedule 1973-74	2
Results.	4
Results for Elementary Building Tuesdays.	4
Activities.	5
Staff Questionnaire	5
Individual Schools	10
Summary of Elementary Building Results.	13
Results for Secondary Building Tuesdays	14
Activities.	14
Staff Questionnaire	16
Individual Secondary Schools.	18
Summary of Secondary Building Results	22
Results for Area and Curriculum Tuesdays.	23
Area Tuesdays	23
Curriculum Tuesdays	24
Results for Consultant (Citywide) Tuesdays.	26
Activities.	26
Staff Questionnaire	27
Consultant Interviews	31
Results for Human Relations Tuesdays.	31
Questionnaire Results	32
Recommendations	35
Appendix A	
Elementary, Secondary, and Human Relations Questionnaires for Participants	39

List of Tables

Number		Page
1	Elementary Released Time Activities and Staff Perceptions of Their Value.	6
2	Planning and Relevance of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Elementary Staff.	8
3	Overall Value of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Elementary Staff.	9
4	Secondary Released Time Activities and Staff Perceptions of Their Value.	15
5	Planning and Relevance of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Secondary Staff	17
6	Overall Value of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Secondary Staff.	19
7	Planning, Relevance, and Overall Value of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff Members	20
8	Elementary Staff Views of the K-12 Articulation Meetings.	25
9	Secondary Staff Views of the Citywide (Consultant) Meetings.	28
10	Secondary Staff Reactions to the Citywide and Consultant Released Time Activities	29
11	Planning, Relevance, and Overall Value of the 1973-74 Human Relations Program as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff.	33
12	Need for More Human Relations Education and Interest in Participation as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff	34
13	Specific Values of the 1973-74 Human Relations Program as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff . .	36

About This Report. . . . . .

This evaluation report, Part I: A Summary of Findings, is one of five parts of the complete evaluation report of the Minneapolis Public Schools' 1973-74 Tuesday Released Time Program. Parts II - V give descriptions of the released time objectives, activities, and specific evaluations for consultants and individual schools: Part II (Citywide), Part III (East Area schools), Part IV (North Area schools), Part V (West Area schools).

Minneapolis Public Schools

An Evaluation of the Minneapolis Public Schools'
1973-74 Tuesday Released Time Program
Part I: A Summary of Findings

During the 1973-74 school year elementary and secondary students in Minneapolis were released from their classes every Tuesday at 2:00 to allow staff members to participate in staff development activities. The released time schedule on page two was established by the Department of Planning and Instruction to coordinate different types of meetings within the decentralized areas. The following guideline for each type of meeting was included with the time schedule.

1. Building Tuesdays. Meetings designated as "Building" were to be used by individual schools as determined by the principal and faculty.
2. Citywide Tuesdays. Three Tuesday meetings were reserved for citywide meetings to be planned by the subject-area consultants.
3. Curriculum Tuesdays. Areas and schools within areas could call upon all consultants and curriculum personnel on the days indicated.
4. Area Tuesdays. Meetings designated as "Area" were to be used in any way the area superintendent decided.
5. Human Relations Tuesdays. Although not included in the time schedule, each area and school was committed to the scheduling of five Tuesday released time meetings for the Human Relations Program.
6. Parent-Teacher Conferences. At the elementary level five Tuesdays in the fall were reserved citywide for parent-teacher conferences. Four more Tuesdays in the spring were optional dates that individual elementary schools could use for parent-teacher conferences.

Evaluation Design

An evaluation strategy was developed with two major considerations in mind. First, it would provide a vehicle for systematic planning and documentation of released time activities within each of the various types of meetings; building, area, citywide, human relations. Second,

TUESDAY RELEASED TIME SCHEDULE
1973-74

DATE		NORTH	SEA	EAST	WEST	SPECIAL
September	11	Building	Building	Building	Building	
	18	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	
	25	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	
October	2	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	
	9	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	
	16	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	
	23	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	
	30	. . . . .	C I T Y W I D E	. . . . .		Parent-Teacher Conf.
November	6	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	Parent-Teacher Conf.
	13	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	Parent-Teacher Conf.
	20	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	Parent-Teacher Conf.
	27	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	Parent-Teacher Conf.
December	4	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	
	11	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	
	18	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	
January	8	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	
	15	Building	Building	Curriculum	Building	
	22	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	
	29	. . . . .	C I T Y W I D E	. . . . .		
February	5	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	
	12	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	
	19	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	Optional P-T Conf.
	26	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	Optional P-T Conf.
March	5	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	Optional P-T Conf.
	12	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	Optional P-T Conf.
	19	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	
	26	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	
April	2	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	
	16	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	
	23	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	
	30	. . . . .	C I T Y W I D E	. . . . .		
May	7	Area	Building	Curriculum	Building	
	14	Building	Area	Building	Curriculum	
	21	Curriculum	Building	Area	Building	
	28	Building	Curriculum	Building	Area	
June	4	Area	Area	Area	Area	
	11	Building	Building	Building	Building	

Breakdown of Tuesdays by type of meeting for each decentralized area

Curriculum	8	8	8	7
Area	8	8	9	9
Building	18	18	17	18
Citywide	3	3	3	3

it would provide outcome measures of released time benefits in addition to surveys of staff opinions.

The evaluation strategy was to proceed through five steps: needs assessment, objective setting, activity planning, process evaluation, and outcome evaluation. In October 1973, once the evaluation strategy had been approved by the Minneapolis Public Schools and the State Department of Education, each individual school was asked to complete the first three steps for the citywide meetings. The three decentralized areas were asked to indicate their objectives and activities for the Area and Curriculum Tuesdays. The plans for human relations Tuesdays were coordinated by the area human relations facilitators.

The Southeast Alternatives (SEA) area within the Minneapolis School System was not included in this evaluation, since it had its own evaluation team.

The process evaluation and outcome evaluation portions of the evaluation strategy had to wait until the first three steps were completed. Based on the objectives and activities returned, and based on the time allocations for evaluation, the following procedures were developed to determine the use and value of the Tuesday Released Time Program.

1. Elementary Building Tuesdays
   a. Each school was asked to provide a description of how they actually used their building Tuesdays.
   b. Staff members at each school were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the value of the program (see Appendix A).
   c. An evaluator interviewed staff members at ten elementary schools to more specifically determine released time accomplishments.
2. Secondary Building Tuesdays
   a. Each school was asked either to describe how they actually used their building Tuesdays, or to provide information related to the achievement of earlier-identified objectives.
   b. Staff members at each school were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the value of the program (See Appendix A).

c. Several secondary schools which used more than four released time meetings for department activities were asked to describe what each department accomplished during released time.

3. Area and Curriculum Tuesdays

The Curriculum Generalists in the three decentralized areas were interviewed to determine their use of these Tuesdays.

4. Citywide Tuesdays

a. The consultants were asked to describe how they used the citywide Tuesdays.

b. Participants completed brief questionnaires after several citywide meetings.

c. Staff members responded to a questionnaire regarding the value of the citywide meetings.

5. Human Relations Tuesdays

Each school completed a human relations questionnaire at the end of the five sessions (see Appendix A).

Results

The results for this section (Part I: Summary of Findings) of the Tuesday Released Time Program evaluation will be presented in the following order: Elementary Building Tuesdays, Secondary Building Tuesdays, Area and Curriculum Tuesdays, Citywide Tuesdays, and Human Relations Tuesdays. As indicated previously, more complete results for consultants and individual buildings within each decentralized area are reported in Parts II - V of the complete evaluation report.

Results for Elementary Building Tuesdays

The response by elementary schools to the October 1973 request for needs, objectives, and planned activities for their building-designated Tuesdays was good. Forty-seven of the 55 schools that were requested to provide information (seven schools in the East Area expanded community schools area were excluded) sent in documents that described their needs, objectives, and planned activities. A copy of each school's plans for

their building Tuesdays is included in other parts of this report: Part III (East Area), Part IV (North Area), Part V (West Area).

The identified needs and objectives varied greatly among schools, although many schools had objectives related to improved parent communications and development of new skills and knowledges among the staff. The clarity of the statements of objectives also varied greatly among schools. Some schools stated their objectives in very clear, measurable behavioral terms, while other schools made general statements, or statements related to activities rather than behavioral outcomes.

Staff Questionnaire

The elementary staff questionnaire (see Appendix A) sent to all schools in June 1974 was completed by about 70% of the staff members. Since it was sent out late in the school year, a few schools were not able to get staff reactions. Two schools are not included in the totals because their responses were received too late. The staff views for individual elementary schools that completed questionnaires can be found in Parts III, IV, and V.

Activities

The elementary questionnaire asked for staff perceptions of how they spent their building-designated Tuesdays (Table 1 on page 6). Parent-teacher conferences were a common use of released time; 78% of the staff members said they spent four or more building Tuesdays talking with parents about students. Meetings of the total school faculty to discuss school policies and procedures, or to discuss the curriculum and educational program were common (about 80% of the respondents said two or more Tuesdays were used for each of these activities). Working with other staff members on program and curriculum development, meetings to learn about other educational programs, desegregation-integration program planning, and discussions with other staff members about student management were also common.

When inservice meetings in the subject areas were held, they were usually one-shot sessions rather than extended programs over several Tuesdays. About two-thirds of the respondents said they did not have any released time to individually do as they wished.

Table 1

Elementary Released Time Activities and Staff Perceptions of Their Value

How much time did you spend on this activity on Building Tuesdays?				N=1016	How Valuable Were These Activities?[a]		
4 or More Tues.	2 or 3 Tues.	One Tues.	None	Activity	Very Valuable	Of Some Value	Of No Value
46%	32%	15%	7%	Meetings of total faculty to discuss school policies, procedures, budget	58%	41%	2%
41	41	11	7	Meetings of total faculty to discuss the curriculum and educational program	61	39	1
33	41	14	12	Working on program and curriculum development with other staff members in your school	69	30	1
8	24	28	40	Individual time to work on specific curriculum development tasks	77	21	2
4	15	19	62	Individual time to do as one wishes	81	16	2
78	11	3	8	Conferences with parents about students	90	10	0
11	32	27	30	Discussions with other staff members about student behavior, management, discipline	65	33	1
9	24	32	35	Meetings with parents to discuss the curriculum and educational program	59	38	2
12	41	25	22	Meetings to learn about other educational programs (alternatives, etc.)	53	46	1
13	21	20	46	Meetings with secondary school staff members	23	57	20
25	19	14	43	Program planning meetings with staff members from other elementary schools part of the desegregation plans	54	41	5
4	17	25	54	Reading inservice	58	38	4
2	17	41	40	Math inservice	57	39	4
2	5	30	63	Science inservice	43	47	10
4	11	30	55	Social studies inservice	41	48	10
4	22	43	31	Language arts inservice	53	42	5

[a]Only respondents who spent time on an activity rated its value.

Staff involvement. Were the staff members aware of building objectives for released time activities? Ninety-five percent of the elementary respondents said their school set objectives that they hoped to accomplish on building Tuesdays (Table 2 on page 8). Sixty-six percent of the staff said they helped set the objectives. This staff involvement in setting objectives varied greatly among schools. All of the staff (100%) said they helped set the objectives at the most positive responding school on this particular question, while 15% of the staff said they helped set the objectives at the least positive school.

Did staff members help plan their building's released time activities? Twenty-nine percent said they were involved in planning many activities and 47% said they helped plan some activities (Table 2). At the most positive school on this item, 100% of the staff said they helped plan many or some activities. At the least positive school on this item, 14% said they planned many or some activities.

Most people felt their building activities were related to their building's needs. Fifty-six percent responded usually, 38% said sometimes, and 7% said seldom. The "usually" response for individual schools ranged from 92% to 0%.

Overall value. Three items on the questionnaire were related to the overall value of the Tuesday Released Time Program. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents said the building released time activities were very worthwhile, 39% said they were somewhat worthwhile, and 4% said they were of little or no worth (Table 3 on page 9). Individual school responses ranged from 100% to 10% on the very worthwhile choice. The majority of the elementary staff members indicated that they did something different on their job this year as a result of the building released time activities; 24% indicated many things, 60% indicated some things.

Ninety-four percent said the released time program should be continued, although 36% said some changes should be made. The response of staff members of individual schools who wanted the program continued ranged from 100% to 55%.

Table 2

Planning and Relevance of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Elementary Staff

Question	Response	Total Elementary N=1016	Most Positive Individual School	Least Positive Individual School
Did your school set objectives or goals that it hoped to accomplish during Building released time activities?	Yes, I helped set the objectives	66%	100% [a]	15% [a]
	Yes, but I did not help set the objectives	29	-	-
	I was not aware of any objectives	5	-	-
To what extent were you involved in planning your Building's released time activities?	I was involved in planning many activities	29	100 [b]	14 [b]
	I was involved in planning some activities	47		
	I had little or no involvement in planning activities	24	-	-
Were the released time activities in your building related to your individual needs?	Usually	56	92 [c]	0 [c]
	Sometimes	38	-	-
	Seldom	7	-	-

[a] The percentage who responded that they helped set the objectives.

[b] The total percentage who responded that they were involved in planning either many or some activities.

[c] The percentage who responded usually.

Table 3

Overall Value of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Elementary Staff

Question	Response	Total Elementary N=1016	Most Positive Individual School	Least Positive Individual School
Overall, how worthwhile were the Building released time activities?	Very worthwhile	57%	100% [a]	10% [a]
	Somewhat worthwhile	39	-	-
	Of little or no worth	4	-	-
Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Building released time activities?	Yes, many things	24	100 [b]	50 [b]
	Yes, some things	60		
	No	16	-	-
Do you think the released time program should be continued?	No	6	-	-
	Yes, continue as is	61	100 [c]	55 [c]
	Yes, with these changes	36		

[a] The percentage who responded very worthwhile.

[b] The total percentage who responded either many things or some things.

[c] The total percentage who responded either continue as is or with these changes.

Value of activities. Most of the more specific released time activities in Table 1 (page 6) were viewed as valuable by elementary staff members who participated in them. For example, 90% of the staff members who had conferences with parents about students said they were very valuable. Although only about half of the respondents said they spent one or more Tuesdays on individual curriculum tasks or doing as one wishes, 80% of those who did participate said it was very valuable.

Most other activities also received favorable ratings, with about half or more of the participants saying they were very valuable. Meetings with secondary school staff members was the least favorably rated activity; 23% said they were very valuable, 57% said of some value, and 20% said of no value.

Individual Schools

Due to time and resource constraints, the outcome evaluation was not carried out to the extent that was originally planned. However, to obtain more specific information about released time accomplishments, ten schools were selected for further study. The evaluator had no prior knowledge of each school's accomplishments. An evaluation assistant visited each of the ten schools and interviewed the principal and the teachers to obtain their views of the released time activities in their school. Each school will be discussed briefly. A more thorough description can be found in Parts III, IV, and V.

Audubon. Feedback from staff and administration was positive. The interviewer's impressions were supported by the staff's response on the questionnaire. Specific accomplishments by the Audubon staff on its building Tuesdays were:

- Plans for a media center have been developed (more time needed).
- Plans made for a grade 4-6 math program for next fall.
- Continuous progress extended to grade 4 next fall.
- Plans were made for an open class and parents and school staff visited other schools to observe open classes in operation.
- Plans to extend mini-classes in grades 5-6 to grade 4 next fall.

Bethune. Bethune is part of a six-school cluster in the desegregation-integration plan to be implemented in the fall of 1974. Teacher feedback in the interviews was positive. The staff listed the following accomplishments on building Tuesdays.

- Meeting with parents from both communities to share ideas and work together.
- Got acquainted with new teammates; sharing views, feelings, methods, philosophies.
- Team program planning for next year.
- Looked at materials needed for next year.
- Looked at alternate programs for next year.
- Dealt with steps to change library to media center.

Bremer. Bremer is part of the Bremer-Cleveland-Willard cluster in the desegregation-integration plan to be implemented in the fall of 1974. Building Tuesday accomplishments were:

- Developed level of trust and working relationships among teachers in the cluster.
- Extensive program planning for next year; booklet developed that explains the three alternative programs.
- Meeting parents and children from new area.
- Time to study and discuss selection of materials and resources.
- Specialists from outside building regarding children's needs.

Calhoun. The interviewer did not talk with the principal (not available). Although teachers valued the idea of released time, they want it to be more meaningful to their needs. Teachers expressed frustration in that many of the planned meetings were cancelled and teachers had to go to an area cluster meeting in which they were not involved. Staff questionnaire results support teacher views (29% said released time activities were "usually" related to their needs).

Cooper. Most of the building Tuesdays were used to plan and carry out programs to improve human relations and attitudes among staff, students, and parents at Cooper. No direct evidence of changed attitudes, but teacher feedback to interviewer was very positive. See Cooper section in Part III for listing of their activities.

Fuller. Fuller will be closed next year and its students will attend Field-Hale. The building Tuesdays during the first half of the year were used to further develop and expand the Continuous Progress Program. This included classification of students, comprehensive planning and assessment, and home visits to explain program objectives to parents. Many of the other building Tuesdays, particularly toward the end of the year, were used to meet with the Field-Hale staff to plan for next year.

Harrison. Harrison is part of the Bryn Mawr-Douglas-Harrison-Kenwood cluster in the desegregation/integration plan to be implemented in the fall of 1974. An administrative decision regarding the exact boundaries was not made until late in the year. This made it difficult to complete cluster planning by the staff for next year (one of their released time objectives), although the Harrison staff did meet with the staff from the other cluster schools several times toward the end of the year. Other activities and accomplishments during building Tuesdays were:

- Became familiar with new math materials and games.
- Discussed other programs with staff from Field-Hale and Marcy Open School.
- Discussed building problems.
- Parent conferences.
- Allowed time for teacher input to book ordering and budget.

Kenny. The Kenny staff identified four objectives at the beginning of the year: staff understanding of other ethnic groups, staff preparation for teaching of ethnic cultures, staff interest in and preparation for trying new techniques or curriculum, and staff orientation to a K-12 concept. All activities were related to these objectives. Both the principal and teachers felt they had accomplished the first three objectives. The K-12 orientation objective was not completed; scheduling problems made it difficult to meet with other schools. The positive response given by the staff in the interviews also came out in the staff questionnaires.

Loring. Loring is part of a cluster of schools in the desegregation/integration plan that will be implemented in the fall of 1974. Many of the building Tuesdays were used for cluster planning. However, the Loring staff also had activities related to some of their long range plans to carry through on innovative units. Major accomplishments indicated by the principal and teachers were:

- Cluster planning regarding classification of students, selecting materials and equipment, meetings with parents, program development, and planning exchange activities for children.
- Became aware of language arts approaches and materials.
- Met with Multi-Ethnic Task Force representative to discuss materials.

Standish. Most of the building Tuesdays were used to plan programs for next year's desegregation. Standish will become part of a three-school cluster that will offer three alternative programs; contemporary, continuous progress, and modified open. Teachers indicated the following activities: teachers and parents met to write philosophy, develop goals, decide on programs, survey and order materials, and discuss the program for next year. Many other meetings in addition to the released time sessions were held to complete the tasks.

Based on visits to ten elementary schools, it was the interviewer's opinion that, with few exceptions, the building-designated released time periods had been used productively in nine of the ten elementary schools. Staff response was favorable and evidence existed to indicate that staff members were engaged in many worthwhile activities.

Summary of Elementary Building Results

Did the elementary schools make good use of the Tuesday released time sessions that were designated as the responsibility of individual schools? Although it was not feasible to evaluate the programs at each school, the information that was collected indicates an answer of yes. Most schools turned in needs, objectives, and planned activities for the building Tuesdays that indicated that attention had been given to planning meaningful programs. Staff questionnaires showed that parent-teacher conferences, faculty meetings to discuss school policies and procedures, staff meetings about program and curriculum development, meetings to learn about other educational programs, and desegregation-integration program planning were common uses of building Tuesdays.

Although there was great variation among schools, the majority of the staff members said they helped set the objectives, helped plan the activities, and felt the activities were related to their building needs.

Fifty-seven percent of the questionnaire respondents said the building released time activities were very worthwhile, 39% said they were somewhat worthwhile, and 4% said they were of little or no worth. Most of the staff members indicated they did something different on their job this year as a result of the building activities; 24% indicated many things, 60% indicated some things. Ninety-four percent said the released time program should be continued, although 36% said some changes should be made.

The principal and teachers at ten elementary schools were interviewed to obtain more specific information about released time accomplishments. With a few exceptions, staff response was favorable, and evidence was available that building-designated released time periods had been used productively in these elementary schools.

Results for Secondary Building Tuesdays

The proposed evaluation strategy met with some difficulties at the secondary level. About half of the secondary schools responded to the October 1973 request for needs, objectives, and planned activities. It is not known why more schools did not respond. Of the secondary schools who did respond, some provided detailed plans including department objectives, while others were quite general. Plans for each school's building Tuesdays are given in other parts of the complete evaluation report: Part III (East Area), Part IV (North Area), Part V (West Area).

Activities

In January 1974 most schools, particularly those who had not given information about their objectives and planned activities, were asked to keep a record and brief description of their building released time activities. These records were sent in at the end of the school year by most of the secondary schools. Copies can be found in Parts III, IV, and V.

The questionnaire sent to all secondary schools in May 1974 (see Appendix A) and completed by about three-fourths of the staff members asked for staff perceptions of how they spent their building-designated Tuesdays (Table 4 on page 15). Staff views corresponded with the description of activities submitted by schools at the end of the year. Meetings of the total faculty to discuss matters such as school policies, procedures, and budget, and department meetings to work on program and curriculum development were the most common uses of building Tuesdays. About half of the questionnaire respondents said they spent at least four Tuesdays on each of these two activities. About half of the respondents said they spent two or more Tuesdays on the following activities: meetings of the total faculty to

Table 4

Secondary Released Time Activities and Staff Perceptions of Their Value

How much time did you spend on this activity on Building Tuesdays?				N=1140	How Valuable Were These Activities? [a]		
4 or More Tues.	2 or 3 Tues.	One Tues.	None	Activity	Very Valuable	Of Some Value	Of No Value
47%	38%	10%	5%	Meetings of total faculty to discuss school policies, procedures, budget	36%	60%	4%
13	46	24	17	Meetings of total faculty to discuss the curriculum and educational program	31	64	5
9	41	27	22	Meetings of total faculty to hear an invited speaker	28	64	8
51	34	10	4	Department meetings to work on program and curriculum development	63	35	2
14	40	29	17	Department meetings to work on such things as book orders, staff assignments	62	35	3
4	16	19	61	Meetings with other departments, but not total faculty, to plan curriculum	39	53	7
7	29	24	39	Individual time to work on specific curriculum development tasks	65	32	3
4	18	21	58	Individual time to do as one wishes	67	29	4
5	13	19	63	Meetings with other staff members to discuss individual students	50	46	4
1	7	19	73	Meetings with parents to discuss the curriculum and educational program	39	52	9

[a]Only respondents who spent time on an activity rated its value.

discuss the curriculum and educational programs, meetings of the total faculty to hear an invited speaker, and department meetings to work on things such as book orders and staff assignments. Some time was spent by about half of the staff members to individually work on curriculum tasks or other activities. Little time was spent on inter-department meetings, meetings among staff to discuss individual students, and meetings with parents to discuss the educational program.

Staff Questionnaire

The secondary staff questionnaire also was used to collect staff views of the Tuesday Released Time Program's value. All schools except one returned completed questionnaires. One other school is not included in the totals because its responses were received too late. The results for individual schools can be found in Parts III, IV, and V.

Staff involvement. Were the secondary staff members involved in the planning of their released time program? Seventy-five percent of the secondary respondents said their school set objectives for their released time Tuesdays (Table 5 on page 17). Thirty-four percent of the staff said they helped set the objectives. Staff participation in setting the objectives varied among schools. At the school that responded most positively to this question, 51% of the staff said they helped set the objectives, while 9% of the staff at the least positive school said they helped set the objectives.

About half (54%) of the respondents indicated that they helped plan their school's released time activities; 11% indicated many activities and 43% some activities. At the most positive school on this question, 84% of the staff said they helped plan many or some activities, while at the least positive school, 20% said they were involved in planning activities.

Thirty-three percent of the secondary staff felt the activities were usually related to their individual needs, 54% of the staff said they were related sometimes, and 13% said seldom.

Overall value. Although most secondary staff members said the building released time activities were at least somewhat worthwhile, the overall response was not extremely favorable. On a three-point scale, thirty-two percent of the secondary staff members said the building released time activities were very worthwhile, 58% said they were somewhat worthwhile,

Table 5

Planning and Relevance of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Secondary Staff

Question	Response	Total Secondary N=1140	Most Positive Individual School	Least Positive Individual School
Did your school set objectives or goals that it hoped to accomplish during Building released time activities?	Yes, I helped set the objective	34%	51% [a]	9% [a]
	Yes, but I did not help set the objectives	41	-	-
	I was not aware of any objectives	25	-	-
To what extent were you involved in planning your Building's released time activities?	I was involved in planning many activities	11	84 [b]	20 [b]
	I was involved in planning some activities	43		
	I had little or no involvement in planning activities	46		
Were the released time activities in your building related to your individual needs?	Usually	33	59 [c]	11 [c]
	Sometimes	54	-	-
	Seldom	13	-	-

[a] The percentage who said they helped set the objectives.

[b] The total percentage who said they were involved in planning either many or some activities.

[c] The percentage who responded usually.

and 10% said they were of little or no worth (Table 6 on page 19). Responses by individual schools ranged from 75% to 11% on the very worthwhile choice.

Somewhat more than half of the respondents said they did something different on their job this year as a result of the building released time activities; 10% indicated many things, 51% indicated some things.

Value of Activities. The more specific released time activities in Table 4 were viewed as having at least some value by almost all of the secondary staff who participated in them. Department meetings and individual time activities received the highest value ratings. About two-thirds of those who participated rated them as being very valuable. Other activities, including the three types of faculty meetings, were rated as very valuable by about one-third of the participants.

Secondary-Elementary comparisons. Elementary school personnel expressed substantially more favorable opinions about the building released time activities than did secondary school personnel (Table 7 on page 20). Almost twice as many elementary than secondary staff members reported that they helped set the objectives for their building Tuesdays and that the released time activities were related to their individual needs. On the overall value scale, 57% of the elementary personnel, compared with 32% of the secondary personnel, said the building released time activities were very worthwhile.

Individual Secondary Schools

In an attempt to obtain more specific information about building released time accomplishments, a few schools were asked to provide information relative to the achievement of objectives that were identified at the beginning of the year, while other schools were asked to specifically describe what each department accomplished on building Tuesdays that were set aside for department meetings. Several schools will be discussed briefly. More complete information on all schools can be found in Parts III, IV, and V.

Franklin Junior High. Franklin's identified released time need was to develop a magnet program, as part of the desegregation-integration plan, for implementation in September 1974. Franklin's major objective,

Table 6

Overall Value of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Secondary Staff

Question	Response	Total Secondary N=1140	Most Positive Individual School	Least Positive Individual School
Overall, how worthwhile were the Building released time activities?	Very worthwhile	32%	75% [a]	11% [a]
	Somewhat worthwhile	58	-	-
	Of little or no worth	10	-	-
Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Building released time activities?	Yes, many things	10	88 [b]	40 [b]
	Yes, some things	51		
	No	38	-	-

[a] The percentage who said very worthwhile.

[b] The total percentage who said either many things or some things.

Table 7

Planning, Relevance, and Overall Value of Released Time Activities as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff Members

Question Question	Response	Total Elementary N=1016	Total Secondary N=1140
Did your school set objectives or goals that it hoped to accomplish during Building released time activities?	Yes, I helped set the objectives	66%	34%
	Yes, but I did not help set the objectives	29	41
	I was not aware of any objectives	5	25
To what extent were you involved in planning your Building's released time activities?	I was involved in planning many activities	29	11
	I was involved in planning some activities	47	43
	I had little or no involvement in planning activities	24	46
Were the released time activities in your building related to your individual needs?	Usually	56	33
	Sometimes	38	54
	Seldom	7	13
Overall, how worthwhile were the Building released time activities?	Very worthwhile	57	32
	Somewhat worthwhile	39	58
	Of little or no worth	4	10
Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Building released time activities?	Yes, many things	24	10
	Yes, some things	60	51
	No	16	38
Do you think the released time program should be continued?	No	6	a
	Yes, continue as is	61	
	Yes, with these changes	36	

[a]This item was not included on the secondary questionnaire

to attract students from outside its attendance area, cannot be evaluated until the 1974-75 school year. Twelve building released time sessions were used in 1973-74 to develop the magnet school proposal. These meetings included departmental curriculum development; faculty discussions regarding budget, community survey results, preliminary proposals; steering committee reports. A newspaper outlining the magnet school proposal was developed and sent to parents and school personnel.

Bryant Y.E.S. Bryant Y.E.S., a school with about fifty junior high students who have not adjusted well to the regular junior high, is a notable example of planned released time activities. At the beginning of the year the staff members identified several needs and then established objectives and planned activities to meet the identified needs. During the year, building released time meetings were used to develop a policy for dealing with drugs at the school, to develop and evaluate a system of home visits to improve communications between home and school, to review a committee's report on a report card revision, to develop a set of team objectives, to discuss a report by the academic planning committee on current testing and prescriptive learning techniques, to develop a system and orientation program for new students, and to introduce and discuss a career education curriculum.

The response by eight staff members on the questionnaire supported the other evaluation materials provided by the school. All eight staff members said the released time activities were usually related to their individual needs. Most of them said the building released time activities were very worthwhile.

Anthony Junior High. Anthony submitted one of the most complete descriptions of their building released time objectives and planned activities. About half of the building Tuesdays were used for total faculty meetings. The two sessions on Adlerian psychology were well received; about 75% of the participants felt the concepts that were presented would help them reach their goals.

The other building Tuesdays were used by departments. At the end of the year, each department was asked to indicate specifically what they had accomplished. Some departments indicated quite clearly what they had done in the area of curriculum development and departmental business matters, while other departments made general statements like "planned curriculum changes for next year."

Senior high schools. Although descriptions of released time activities were not provided by all senior high schools, the records available (see Parts III, IV, and V) indicate that most senior high schools used the building released time periods for (1) faculty meetings to discuss program planning, budget, and operational procedures such as registration, attendance, and grading, and (2) department meeting to plan curriculum and discuss such things as budget, materials, and scheduling.

Several high schools were requested to describe what each department accomplished on building Tuesdays designated for department meetings. Although many of the descriptions are not specific, the reports from North, Roosevelt, and South indicate that most departments, particularly the larger ones, used released time for curriculum development, and that most departments used released time for work on things such as budgets, scheduling, and equipment-materials selection.

Summary of Secondary Building Results

Did the secondary schools make good use of the Tuesday released time sessions that were designated as the responsibility of individual schools? The evaluation information available indicates that the building released time activities at most secondary schools were of some value to the staff members, although the evidence is not strongly favorable and substantial room for improvement exists.

Staff questionnaires and building records showed that faculty meetings to discuss matters such as school policies, procedures, budget, and program planning, and department meetings to work on program development or to discuss things such as budget and equipment orders were the most common uses of building Tuesdays. Although there was substantial variation among schools, overall, one-third of the secondary staff said they helped set the objectives for the building released time activities, while 11% said they helped plan many and 43% said they helped plan some of the released time activities. This rather limited involvement in planning expressed by the staff corresponds with the fifty-percent response by secondary schools to the fall 1973 request for released time needs, objectives, and planned activities. One-third of the secondary participants said the building released time activities were usually related to their individual needs and another half said the activities were sometimes related to their needs.

Thirty-two percent of questionnaire respondents said the building released time activities were very worthwhile, 58% said they were somewhat worthwhile, and 10% said they were of little or no worth. Somewhat more than half of the staff members indicated that they did something different on their job this year as a result of building activities; 10% indicated many things, 51% indicated some things.

Compared with elementary school personnel, secondary personnel expressed substantially less favorable opinions of the building released time activities.

Results for Area and Curriculum Tuesdays

The evaluation of Area and Curriculum Tuesdays was limited to a determination of how these sessions were used. A more complete description of the activities that occurred on these days can be found at the beginning of the sections for each decentralized area; Parts III, IV, and V.

Area Tuesdays

The Tuesdays designated as the responsibility of each of the decentralized areas were used differently by each area, although most Area Tuesdays were given to individual buildings.

East Area. Three of the nine Area Tuesdays were given to the individual buildings to use as they wished, two Area Tuesdays were designated as planning days for the Human Relations Program, and two were designated for interschool meetings if the schools wished to initiate the meeting. The area staff worked with four junior highs to develop an interschool meeting centered around alternative education. The junior and senior high staffs met jointly on another Area day to discuss common concerns, such as, trimester, articulation, discipline, standards, staff roles, middle school, classroom strategies, and desegregation/integration. The other Area day was used for an area-wide chemical dependency program, emphasizing problems of alcohol abuse.

North Area. All Area Tuesdays were turned over to the individual buildings; three for the Human Relations Program and five for use as determined by individual schools.

West Area. The West Area identified some objectives and outlined the activities for Area Tuesdays in the fall of the school year. Four of the

Area Tuesdays were given to the Human Relations Program. Two Area days were given to elementary schools for parent-teacher conferences, while secondary schools met in junior-senior high clusters to discuss two questions: Where and how do we most effectively provide 7-12 curriculum continuity? and What do you see as needs/problems in providing curriculum continuity? The West Area scheduled two area-wide programs for the last two Area days, one on chemical dependency, the other featuring the national founder of Montessori, who spoke on a "change" theme.

Curriculum Tuesdays

The Curriculum Tuesdays were apparently confusing to everyone. At first it was not clear who was responsible for setting up the Curriculum Tuesday programs. Originally, the consultants and other curriculum personnel were to be "on call" to areas or schools within areas. Then, consultants were asked to plan some area-wide programs for secondary personnel on Curriculum Tuesdays. The administration, the curriculum generalists assigned to areas, and the consultants assigned to the central office did agree on some program responsibilities, but lack of coordination and communication handicapped some efforts.

East Area. The first five Curriculum Tuesdays were given to individual buildings at the elementary level, while consultants were asked to plan programs for secondary personnel in their subject area. The last three curriculum Tuesdays in the East Area, as well as the North and West Areas, were to be used for K-12 planning. All secondary personnel were to attend meetings conducted by their subject-area consultant, while elementary teachers were to attend the meetings of either the English, math, science, or social studies consultant. Before the last two meetings, the plan was cancelled in the East Area and the Tuesdays were given to individual buildings. The reasons given by the East Area office for cancellation were staff dissatisfaction with programs, confusion, lack of commitment, and greater needs within individual schools.

North Area. The consultants and area curriculum personnel were on call the first two Curriculum Tuesdays. The next three days were planned by the consultants at the secondary level. At the elementary level, the area curriculum generalist coordinated a series of offerings for two of these three days that included programs in each of the disciplines, plus some interdisciplinary programs mainly in affective education. The last

three Curriculum Tuesdays were used for the K-12 programs coordinated by the consultants. These programs, as well as previously mentioned area-wide curriculum programs, were not attended by all staff members because individual schools involved in cluster planning were given the option whether or not to attend by the North Area administration.

West Area. The first Curriculum Tuesday was given to individual buildings. The second was used for parent-teacher conferences at the elementary level and for consultant-planned programs at the secondary level. Buildings were encouraged to use the next two curriculum days for K-12 cluster meetings. Although a record was not kept of all meetings, staff concerns at these meetings resulted in a statement on K-12 curriculum continuity by the area superintendent. The last three Curriculum Tuesdays were used for the consultant-planned K-12 articulation meetings.

Elementary Questionnaire. Elementary staff members were asked to indicate whether or not they attended K-12 articulation meetings and to rate the value of these meetings. It was assumed that most of the respondents would refer to the consultant-planned K-12 meetings that were held on the Curriculum Tuesdays and in some subject areas, the citywide meetings. About one-third to half of the respondents said they attended a meeting in each of the four subject areas; English, math, science, and social studies (Table 8 below). Half of the participants said the meetings

Table 8

Elementary Staff Views of the K-12 Articulation Meetings

Question	Response	Percent
Did you attend any meetings in the following subject area that were designed to promote K-12 articulation?	English	51%
	Math	51
	Science	34
	Social Studies	46
If you did attend any of these meetings, how worthwhile were these meetings?	Very worthwhile	14
	Worthwhile	42
	Not very worthwhile	31
	Worthless	13
Do you think there is a need for more K-12 articulation?	Yes, a high priority need	32
	Yes, but not a high priority need	52
	No	16

were worthwhile or very worthwhile. Although 84% of the elementary staff who completed the questionnaire indicated there is a need for more K-12 articulation, only 32% saw it as a high priority need.

Results for Consultant (Citywide) Tuesdays

Three Tuesday released time sessions were designated as citywide meetings to be organized by the subject-area and support-service consultants. The majority of the citywide meetings included secondary personnel only (e.g. foreign language, industrial arts, work experience coordinators), while others included both elementary and secondary personnel (e.g. librarians, social workers, music teachers). Elementary classroom teachers did not attend these meetings, with the exception of the citywide meetings in some subject areas that were specifically set aside for K-12 articulation.

As mentioned earlier, the consultants were given some responsibilities for the curriculum Tuesdays as well as the three citywide Tuesdays. In addition to being on call to the decentralized areas, the consultants were requested to plan or coordinate area-wide programs on many of the curriculum Tuesdays. The evaluation plan did not include a record of these activities, although many consultants organized and conducted meetings on these days.

Activities

The structure of the citywide meetings varied among consultants. Some meetings were large group presentations to all personnel in a particular subject or supportive field, other meetings were organized by decentralized areas, and others provided a choice of several small group presentations. A rather complete description of objectives and activities for each of the citywide meetings can be found by subject and supportive field in Part II of the evaluation report. Part II also includes the reactions of secondary personnel by subject-supportive field to the consultant meetings, and, in some cases, participant reactions to particular citywide meetings. For example, 70% of the home economics teachers thought the October 30th citywide meeting was very much related to their individual needs and 76% thought the meeting was very useful to them.

Staff Questionnaire

Several questions related to the citywide meetings and meetings coordinated by the consultants on curriculum Tuesdays were included in the released time evaluation questionnaire given to all secondary personnel (see Appendix A). Elementary personnel who attended the citywide meetings were not given the questions. Therefore, the results presented in this section will represent the feelings of secondary staff members only, and may not represent the feelings of the total participating group in fields, such as social workers and librarians, that have a substantial number of elementary positions.

Three-fourths of the respondents said they attended all of the meetings organized by their consultant, while one-fourth said they attended some of the meetings. Overall, the participants' reactions to the meetings tended to be positive, but somewhat less favorable than their ratings of the building released time activities (Table 9 on page 28).

About one-third of the participants said the consultant released time activities were usually related to their individual needs, 39% said sometimes they were related to their needs, and 25% said seldom. Overall, one-fourth of the respondents said the activities were very worthwhile, about one-half said they were somewhat worthwhile, and about one-fourth said they were of little or no worth. Half of the participants said they have done something differently on their job as a result of the consultant meetings, with 6% saying they did many things differently.

The majority of the respondents indicated that the released time activities helped them to become aware of new materials or methods, other education programs, and curriculum at other secondary grade levels. About half of the participants also said they developed a skill that can be used on the job, and became more aware of curriculum at the elementary level.

Results by Field. Participant response to the consultant meetings differed substantially among subject and supportive areas (Table 10 on page 29). For example, on the relevance item, the responses ranged from 88% of the librarians and 81% of the foreign language teachers and 12% of the social studies teachers and 18% of the English teachers who said the consultant released time activities were "usually" related to their individual needs.

Table 9

Secondary Staff Views of the Citywide (Consultant) Meetings
(N=1140)

Question	Response	Percent
Did you attend the released time meetings organized by your subject area consultant?	Yes, all of them	73%
	Yes, some of them	26
	No, none of them	1
Were the Consultant released time activities related to your individual needs?	Usually	36
	Sometimes	39
	Seldom	25
Overall, how worthwhile were the Consultant released time activities?	Very worthwhile	25
	Somewhat worthwhile	53
	Of little or no worth	22
Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Consultant released time activities?	Yes, many things	6
	Yes, some things	44
	No	50

	Yes, A Lot	Yes, Some	No
Did the Consultant released time activities help you in each of the following ways?			
Became aware of new materials or methods	23%	57%	19%
Developed a skill that can be used on the job	9	44	46
Became aware of other educational programs	21	59	20
Became more aware of curriculum at elementary level	12	39	49
Became more aware of curriculum at other secondary grade levels	17	59	24

Table 10

Secondary Staff Reactions to the Citywide and Consultant Released Time Activities

Question and Response	Art N=37	Business N=37	Counselor N=56	English N=169	Foreign Language N=27	Home Economics N=54	Industrial Arts N=81	Social Worker N=19	Librarian N=18	Math N=128	Music N=33	Physical Education N=65	Science N=63	Social Studies N=141	Special Education N=69	Work Coordinator N=35
Did you attend the released time meetings organized by your subject area consultant?																
Yes, all of them	86%	78%	80%	69%	81%	91%	79%	74%	76%	76%	67%	60%	58%	81%	71%	83%
Yes, some of them	14	22	20	31	19	9	21	26	18	24	33	40	42	19	29	14
No, none of them	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Were the Consultant released time activities related to your individual needs?																
Usually	51	50	33	18	81	69	42	42	88	37	55	38	35	12	33	68
Sometimes	35	33	46	45	7	28	43	42	6	43	27	45	37	43	43	18
Seldom	14	17	20	37	11	4	15	16	6	20	18	17	29	46	24	15
Did the Consultant released time activities help you in each of the following ways?																
Became aware of new materials or methods																
Yes, a lot	39	41	26	9	56	59	21	12	81	27	22	9	19	14	17	26
Yes, some	56	57	58	58	33	39	68	76	19	60	56	69	59	62	52	59
No	6	3	15	33	11	19	11	12	0	13	22	22	22	24	31	15
Developed a skill that can be used on the job																
Yes, a lot	24	3	7	4	22	17	5	12	38	11	6	11	8	4	11	15
Yes, some	46	61	44	30	52	43	48	59	38	49	47	60	50	39	50	42
No	30	36	49	66	26	40	48	29	25	40	47	29	42	58	39	42
Became aware of other educational programs																
Yes, a lot	31	31	20	16	41	44	14	12	56	20	31	14	19	13	26	24
Yes, some	53	61	76	59	37	44	71	65	44	66	53	59	59	60	50	70
No	17	8	4	25	22	12	15	24	0	14	16	27	22	27	24	6
Became more aware of curriculum at elementary level																
Yes, a lot	19	0	13	18	4	2	5	0	33	19	28	5	24	6	8	6
Yes, some	51	25	45	44	50	27	24	31	60	56	41	39	56	24	38	13
No	30	75	42	38	46	71	71	69	7	25	31	56	19	71	54	81

Table 10 (continued)

	Art	Business	Counselor	English	Foreign Language	Home Economics	Industrial Arts	Social Worker	Librarian	Math	Music	Physical Education	Science	Social Studies	Special Education	Work Coordinator
Did the Consultant released time activities help you in each of the following ways? (continued)																
Became more aware of curriculum at other secondary levels																
Yes, a lot	31	20	11	13	33	38	9	12	50	15	28	14	13	10	15	22
Yes, some	56	60	67	54	52	54	74	53	38	69	28	68	66	54	62	47
No	14	20	22	33	15	8	18	35	13	16	44	17	21	36	23	31
Overall, how worthwhile were the Consultant released time activities?																
Very worthwhile	39	28	27	13	74	54	20	37	81	28	42	24	18	9	17	39
Somewhat worthwhile	53	69	56	54	11	43	67	42	13	50	36	61	60	49	66	48
Of little or no worth	8	3	16	33	15	4	13	21	6	22	21	15	23	42	17	12
Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Consultant released time activities?																
Yes, many things	14	3	2	4	27	4	3	17	20	10	6	3	8	3	11	3
Yes, some things	51	57	48	31	50	52	45	44	60	51	47	38	47	35	55	62
No	35	41	50	65	23	44	53	39	20	40	47	58	45	62	34	35

In response to a question about the worthwhileness of the consultant released time activities, the "very worthwhile" response ranged from 9% for English and physical education teachers to 59% for home economics teachers and 81% for librarians.

Consultant Interviews

Several of the consultants were interviewed by the evaluator to determine their views of the released time program. Two points were stressed by the consultants. One, they did not feel the ninety-minute released time period was long enough to conduct the most appropriate and most valuable staff development activities. Also, many staff members spent almost as much time traveling to and from the meeting as in the meeting itself. The consultants as a group recommended half-day meetings to the administration for the 1974-75 school year.

Two, the consultants were dissatisfied with the lack of clearly defined responsibilities for the Curriculum Tuesdays and the lack of coordination between planned Curriculum Tuesday activities and building activities.

Results for Human Relations Tuesdays

Five Tuesday released time sessions in each decentralized area were set aside for the Human Relations Program. The North and West Areas designated five of the Area or Curriculum Tuesdays for human relations activities, while the East Area left it up to the individual schools. The Human Relations Program was coordinated by three human relations facilitators (one for each area) in the Minneapolis Schools' Department of Intergroup Education. Each school building and special location had a human relations chairperson who was responsible for the human relations activities in that particular location.

Although each building and location was to develop its own objectives and activities in response to its particular human relations needs, some overall staff development goals expressed in the Minneapolis Schools' desegregation/integration plan were used as general guidelines. These staff development goals were (1) that staff members should develop the ability to communicate effectively with sensitivity, and (2) that staff members should be sensitive to values, attitudes, and outlooks possessed by various individuals.

The Tuesday human relations activities varied greatly. Some of the emphasized activities were community-school relations, ethnic-cultural awareness, classroom human relations methods, staff-staff relationships, personal growth, staff-student relationships, and understanding children.

This section will summarize the results of a questionnaire given to all elementary and secondary personnel and is based on a more comprehensive, separate evaluation report of the 1973-74 Human Relations Program (see Appendix A for questionnaire). Results for individual schools can be found in Parts III, IV, and V of the complete Tuesday Released Time Program evaluation report.

Questionnaire Results

Participants' responses to the Human Relations Program were generally favorable. Elementary participants had substantially more favorable views than did secondary participants.

Planning and relevance. About 80% of the elementary respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that (1) they had a clear idea of the purpose of the human relations program in their school, (2) they had some input into what the human relations program would be, and (3) the human relations program was related to the needs in their school (Table 11 on page 33). About 60% of the secondary respondents agreed with the same statements.

Overall value. About two-thirds of the elementary participants said that, overall, the activities had a positive impact on interpersonal relations in their location, that the program was worthwhile, and that the Tuesday emphasis on human relations transferred to their school environment or their work as an individual. About half of the secondary participants gave positive responses to the same items. For example, 11% of the elementary and 5% of the secondary participants said the human relations activities were very worthwhile, and 58% of the elementary and 41% of the secondary participants said the human relations activities were worthwhile.

Future needs. About seventy percent of both the elementary and secondary participants said there is a need for more human relations education in the following areas: intra-interpersonal relationships, awareness of cultural pluralism, and program change and development (Table 12 on page 34). However, a substantially smaller percentage (54% of the elementary and 41% of the secondary respondents) indicated that

Table 11

Planning, Relevance, and Overall Value of the 1973-74 Human Relations Program as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff (Elementary, N=1551; Secondary, N=1417)

Statement	Staff Level	Response[a] SA	A	D	SD
I had a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the HRP for my school or project	Elem	21%	60%	16%	3%
	Sec	11	50	32	7
I had some input into what the Human Relations Program would be	Elem	23	53	18	6
	Sec	16	50	23	11
The HRP in my school was related to the needs in my school	Elem	20	59	16	5
	Sec	10	50	27	12

Question	Response	Elementary	Secondary
Overall, what impact did the human relations activities have on interpersonal relations in your school or project?	Improved greatly	5%	1%
	Improved some	60	44
	Did not change	29	45
	Became worse	4	7
	No improvement was needed	2	3
All in all, how worthwhile were the human relations activities to you?	Very worthwhile	11	5
	Worthwhile	58	41
	Not very worthwhile	27	43
	Worthless	4	11
Has the Tuesday emphasis on human relations transferred to your school environment or to your work as an individual?	Yes, a lot of transfer	11	4
	Yes, some transfer	65	49
	No	25	47

[a]SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

Table 12

Need for More Human Relations Education and Interest in Participation as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff (Elementary, N=1551; Secondary, N=1417)

Statement	Staff Level	Response[a]			
		SA	A	D	SD
There is a need for more human relations education within my school or project regarding:					
Intra-interpersonal relationships	Elem	26%	45%	23%	7%
	Sec	23	45	22	10
Awareness of cultural pluralism	Elem	19	52	24	6
	Sec	18	47	25	9
Program change and development	Elem	22	52	21	5
	Sec	23	49	21	6
I am interested in participating in more human relations programs	Elem	10	44	28	18
	Sec	8	33	34	25

[a]SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

they were interested in participating in more human relations programs.

Specific values. The participants in the Human Relations Program reacted to several statements related to more specific goals of the program (Table 13 on page 36). About two-thirds of the elementary and half of the secondary respondents indicated that staff relationships had improved as a result of the human relations activities. For example, 72% of the elementary respondents agreed that they got to know other staff members better, 60% said members of their school developed more positive working relationships, and 65% said they improved their interpersonal skills as a result of the Human Relations Program.

Although the objectives for all locations were not directly related to cultural/ethnic needs, a substantial percentage of both elementary and secondary personnel said that, as a result of the human relations activities, they were better able to relate to persons of different races and were more aware of the values and outlooks of cultural and racial groups other than their own.

Some elementary (36%) and secondary (24%) participants felt they were better able to deal with sexism, while 60% of the elementary and 41% of the secondary participants felt they were better able to deal with people of different life styles and values as a result of the Human Relations Program.

Recommendations

The evaluation findings indicated that many positive activities occurred during the Tuesday Released Time Program and that the participants had generally favorable views of the program. Several recommendations for improvement of the released time program are given below.

1. More time should be devoted to planning and organizing released time activities that are related to the needs of the participants. Fifty-six percent of the elementary and 33% of the secondary participants said the building released time activities were "usually" related to their needs. Although conducting a needs assessment and planning relevant activities require considerable time commitments, perhaps the effort spent on these tasks will result in better and more successful programs.

Table 13

Specific Values of the 1973-74 Human Relations Program as Viewed by Elementary and Secondary Staff (Elementary, N=1551; Secondary, N=1417)

Statement	Staff Level	Response[a] SA	A	D	SD
I feel that I improved my interpersonal skills as a result of the HRP[b]	Elem	9%	56%	28%	7%
	Sec	4	39	41	16
I got to know other staff members better as a result of the HRP	Elem	19	53	23	5
	Sec	12	49	29	10
The members of my school or project developed more positive working relationships as a result of the HRP	Elem	7	53	33	7
	Sec	3	38	46	13
I feel better able to relate to persons of different races as a result of the HRP	Elem	7	45	38	9
	Sec	4	31	48	17
I am more aware of the values and outlooks of cultural and racial groups other than my own as a result of the HRP	Elem	9	55	28	7
	Sec	6	39	40	15
I feel better able to deal with sexism as a result of the HRP	Elem	4	32	50	14
	Sec	3	21	52	24
I feel better able to deal with people of different life styles and values as a result of the HRP	Elem	7	53	33	7
	Sec	4	37	44	16
This year I have used the communication skills that were emphasized in last year's (1972-73) HRP	Elem	10	64	21	5
	Sec	4	45	38	14
This year I have seen others using the communication skills that were emphasized in last year's (1972-73) HRP	Elem	7	61	27	5
	Sec	3	38	46	13

[a] SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

[b] HRP=Human Relations Program

2. More released time Tuesdays should be designated as the responsibility of individual schools. Building released time activities were viewed more favorably than other activities by most of the participants, although some activities that were planned by subject and supportive fields were very positively received. The 1973-74 released time schedule had so many different kinds of meetings, that some schools, particularly the elementary schools that used all required and optional parent-teacher conferences, had less than ten building meetings during the year. More, and consecutive week-to-week, building Tuesdays would allow the school activities to have greater depth and to have more continuity from meeting to meeting.

3. Citywide and Curriculum Tuesdays need a different structure and should be more related to the needs of the participants. Although some subject and supportive fields planned citywide and area-wide programs that were rated very positively, in about half of the subject-supportive fields less than fifty percent of the participants said the activities were usually related to their needs. Longer sessions than the present ninety minutes, and within disciplines, sessions involving smaller groups of people who have similar interests and instructional responsibilities should be considered.

4. Efforts should be made to improve the building released time activities at the secondary level. While ninety percent of the secondary staff felt the building activities were at least somewhat worthwhile, only 32% felt they were very worthwhile. Although the evaluation efforts were not thorough and complete information was not available for all schools, it appeared that many of the schools did not have a continuous plan or objectives, but a series of independent faculty meetings and department meetings.

The next two recommendations do not stem directly from the evaluation data, but are based on the evaluator's overall impressions of the Tuesday Released Time Program.

5. A statement of general program guidelines should be made by the central and/or area administrations. What kinds of activities are appropriate? What activities should be emphasized? Are there certain activities that should not occur on released time, such as individual daily classroom preparation, completing administrative clerical tasks or information requests, and general faculty meetings to discuss concerns that are not crucial to the goals of the school system (such as the teacher's pension plan)? Is released time to be used for staff development, for tasks that

would have to be completed whether or not there was released time, or for both?

6. Persons responsible for each component of the Tuesday Released Time Program (school, consultants, area), should take the responsibility for building an evaluation component into its released time plans. The evaluation should include, at a minimum, a record of the released time activities that were conducted and participant judgments about whether or not their objectives were achieved. Perhaps this evaluation requirement, together with the recommendations noted previously, would generally upgrade the overall quality of the released time programs and would reduce the amount of variation in the quality of the programs among individual schools and among subject-supportive fields by eliminating the poor programs.

Appendix A

Elementary, Secondary, and Human
Relations Questionnaires for Participants

Minneapolis Public Schools
Elementary Released Time Evaluation 1973-74

Your reactions to the following questions will be used to suggest improvements in the Tuesday Released Time Program. Your careful attention to the items will increase the meaningfulness of the results. Do not sign your name.

(1-2) 74 Data Processing Number

BUILDING TUESDAYS

Items 3-7 refer to the Tuesdays that were set aside as the responsibility of individual buildings. Your responses should not include the citywide or area-wide meetings or the five human relations Tuesdays.

(3) Did your school set objectives or goals that it hoped to accomplish during Building released time activities?

____1. Yes; I helped set the objectives

____2. Yes; but I did not help set the objectives

____3. I was not aware of any objectives

(4) To what extent were you involved in planning your Building's released time activities?

____1. I was involved in planning many activities

____2. I was involved in planning some activities

____3. I had little or no involvement in planning activities

(5) Were the released time activities in your building related to your individual needs?

____1. Usually

____2. Sometimes

____3. Seldom

(6) Overall, how worthwhile were the Building released time activities?

____1. Very worthwhile

____2. Somewhat worthwhile

____3. Of little or no worth

(7) Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Building released time activities?

____1. Yes, many things

____2. Yes, some things

____3. No

If YES, please briefly describe what you did differently.

(8-9) ____ Leave blank

(10-13) Check whether or not you attended any meetings in the following subject areas that were designed to promote K-12 articulation.

		Yes	No
(10)	English	____	____
(11)	Math	____	____
(12)	Science	____	____
(13)	Social Studies	____	____

(14) If you answered YES to any of the items 10-13, how worthwhile were these meetings?

____1. Very worthwhile

____2. Worthwhile

____3. Not very worthwhile

____4. Worthless

(15) Do you think there is a need for more K-12 articulation?

____1. Yes, a high priority need

____2. Yes, but not a high priority need

____3. No

(16) Do you think the released time program should be continued?

____1. No

____2. Yes, continue as is

____3. Yes, with these changes

(17) Indicate your position in the school.

____1. Classroom teacher

____2. Administrator

____3. Support personnel; resource teacher, SSW, counselor, librarian, etc.

TURN TO OTHER SIDE

Research and Evaluation Department
May 1974

Listed below are some activities in which you may have been involved on Building Tuesdays. On the left, estimate the number of Tuesdays you spent on each activity. Then, on the right, for each activity where you indicated some time spent, indicate the value of the activity.

How much time did you spend on this activity on Building Tuesdays?					How Valuable Were These Activities?			
	4 or More Tuesdays	2 or 3 Tues.	One Tues.	None	Activity	Very Valuable	Of Some Value	Of No Value	
(18)	___	___	___	___	Meetings of total faculty to discuss school policies, procedures, budget	___	___	___	(34)
(19)	___	___	___	___	Meetings of total faculty to discuss the curriculum and educational program	___	___	___	(35)
(20)	___	___	___	___	Working on program and curriculum development with other staff members in your school	___	___	___	(36)
(21)	___	___	___	___	Individual time to work on specific curriculum development tasks	___	___	___	(37)
(22)	___	___	___	___	Individual time to do as one wishes	___	___	___	(38)
(23)	___	___	___	___	Conferences with parents about students	___	___	___	(39)
(24)	___	___	___	___	Discussions with other staff members about student behavior, management, discipline	___	___	___	(40)
(25)	___	___	___	___	Meetings with parents to discuss the curriculum and educational program	___	___	___	(41)
(26)	___	___	___	___	Meetings to learn about other educational programs (alternatives, etc.)	___	___	___	(42)
(27)	___	___	___	___	Meetings with secondary school staff members	___	___	___	(43)
(28)	___	___	___	___	Program planning meetings with staff members from other elementary schools part of the desegregation plans	___	___	___	(44)
(29)	___	___	___	___	Reading inservice	___	___	___	(45)
(30)	___	___	___	___	Math inservice	___	___	___	(46)
(31)	___	___	___	___	Science inservice	___	___	___	(47)
(32)	___	___	___	___	Social studies inservice	___	___	___	(48)
(33)	___	___	___	___	Language arts inservice	___	___	___	(49)
					Other_____				
	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___	
					Other_____				
	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___	

Minneapolis Public Schools
Secondary Released Time Evaluation 1973-74

Your reactions to the following questions will be used to suggest improvements in the Tuesday Released Time Program. Your careful attention to the items will increase the meaningfulness of the results. Do not sign your name.

(1-2) 74 Data Processing Number

BUILDING TUESDAYS

Items 3-31 refer to the Tuesdays that were set aside as the responsibility of individual buildings. Your responses should not include the citywide or area-wide meetings or the five human relations Tuesdays.

(3) Did your school set objectives or goals that it hoped to accomplish during Building released time activities?

____1. Yes; I helped set the objectives

____2. Yes; but I did not help set the objectives

____3. I was not aware of any objectives

(4) To what extent were you involved in planning your Building's released time activities?

____1. I was involved in planning many activities

____2. I was involved in planning some activities

____3. I had little or no involvement in planning activities.

(16) Were the released time activities in your building related to your individual needs?

____1. Usually

____2. Sometimes

____3. Seldom

(17) Overall, how worthwhile were the Building released time activities?

____1. Very worthwhile

____2. Somewhat worthwhile

____3. Of little or no worth

Listed below are some activities in which you may have been involved on Building Tuesdays. On the left, estimate the number of Tuesdays you spent on each activity. Then, on the right, for each activity where you indicated some time spent, indicate the value of the activity.

How much time did you spend on this activity on Building Tuesdays?					How Valuable Were These Activities?			
	4 or More Tuesdays	2 or 3 Tues.	One Tues.	None	Activity	Very Valuable	Of Some Value	Of No Value
(5)	____	____	____	____	Meetings of total faculty to discuss school policies, procedures, budget	____	____	____ (18)
(6)	____	____	____	____	Meetings of total faculty to discuss the curriculum and educational program	____	____	____ (19)
(7)	____	____	____	____	Meetings of total faculty to hear an invited speaker	____	____	____ (20)
(8)	____	____	____	____	Department meetings to work on program and curriculum development	____	____	____ (21)
(9)	____	____	____	____	Department meetings to work on such things as book orders, staff assignments	____	____	____ (22)
(10)	____	____	____	____	Meetings with other departments, but not total faculty, to plan curriculum	____	____	____ (23)
(11)	____	____	____	____	Individual time to work on specific curriculum development tasks	____	____	____ (24)
(12)	____	____	____	____	Individual time to do as one wishes	____	____	____ (25)
(13)	____	____	____	____	Meetings with other staff members to discuss individual students	____	____	____ (26)
(14)	____	____	____	____	Meetings with parents to discuss the curriculum and educational program	____	____	____ (27)
(15)	____	____	____	____	Other_____	____	____	____ (28)
					_____			
					_____			

Research and Evaluation Department
May 1974

(29) Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Building released time activities?

_____1. Yes, many things

_____2. Yes, some things

_____3. No

If YES, please briefly describe what you did differently.

(30-31)_____Leave blank

CITYWIDE (CONSULTANT) TUESDAYS

Items 32-42 refer to Tuesdays that were the responsibility of the subject area consultants. This includes the city-wide Tuesdays and some curriculum Tuesdays that were organized by the subject area consultants.

(32) Did you attend the released time meetings organized by your subject area consultant?

_____1. Yes, all of them

_____2. Yes, some of them

_____3. No, none of them

_____4. No meetings scheduled

(33) Were the Consultant released time activities related to your individual needs?

_____1. Usually

_____2. Sometimes

_____3. Seldom

Did the Consultant released time activities help you in each of the following ways?

	Yes, A lot	Yes Some	No
(34) Became aware of new materials or methods	_____	_____	_____
(35) Developed a skill that can be used on the job	_____	_____	_____
(36) Became aware of other educational programs	_____	_____	_____
(37) Became more aware of curriculum at elementary level	_____	_____	_____
(38) Became more aware of curriculum at other secondary grade levels	_____	_____	_____

(39) Overall, how worthwhile were the Consultant released time activities?

_____1. Very worthwhile

_____2. Somewhat worthwhile

_____3. Of little or no worth

(40) Have you done anything differently on your job this year as a result of the Consultant released time activities?

_____1. Yes, many things

_____2. Yes, some things

_____3. No

If YES, please briefly describe what you did differently.

(41-42)_____Leave blank

(43-44) Indicate your position in your school. If you are a teacher, check the subject area in which you do most of your teaching.

_____01 Administrator
_____02 Art
_____03 Business
_____04 Counselor
_____05 English
_____06 Foreign Language
_____07 Home Economics
_____08 Industrial Arts
_____09 Social Workers
_____10 Librarian
_____11 Math
_____12 Music
_____13 Nurse
_____14 Physical Education
_____15 Science
_____16 Social Studies
_____17 Special Education
_____18 Work Coordinator

(45-46) If you are a teacher, check the school in which you work. Do not check your school if you are not a teacher. Reports for individual schools will be made for the total group of staff members at each school only; results will not be broken down by position.

_____01 More than one school
_____02 Central
_____03 Edison
_____04 Henry Jr-Sr
_____05 Marshall-U Jr-Sr
_____06 North
_____07 Roosevelt
_____08 South
_____09 Southwest Jr
_____10 Vocational
_____11 Washburn
_____12 West
_____13 Anthony
_____14 Bryant
_____15 Folwell
_____16 Franklin
_____17 Jefferson
_____18 Jordan
_____19 Lincoln
_____20 Nokomis
_____21 Northeast
_____22 Olson
_____23 Phillips
_____24 Ramsey
_____25 Sanford
_____26 Sheridan Jr.
_____27 Southwest Jr.
_____28 WOC

Minneapolis Public Schools
Human Relations Program

During the 1973-74 school year each school developed and implemented a human relations program that used five Tuesday released time sessions as a minimum amount of time. Your frank response to the items on this questionnaire will be very helpful in assessing the value of the Human Relations Program and in giving direction to future programs. There are no right or wrong answers; just opinions. Do not sign your name. HRP stands for Human Relations Program. The items start with number (3) for data processing purposes. Your questionnaire will be sent directly to the Research and Evaluation Department for processing and analysis. Thank you.

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number under Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

		SA	A	D	SD
(3)	I had a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the HRP for my school or project	1	2	3	4
(4)	I had some input into what the Human Relations Program would be.	1	2	3	4
(5-7)	There is a need for more human relations education within my school or project regarding:				
(5)	Intra-interpersonal relationships	1	2	3	4
(6)	Awareness of cultural pluralism	1	2	3	4
(7)	Program change and development	1	2	3	4
(8)	I feel that I improved my interpersonal skills as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4
(9)	The HRP in my school was related to the needs in my school.	1	2	3	4
(10)	I got to know other staff members better as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4
(11)	This year I have used the communication skills that were emphasized in last year's (1972-73) HRP.	1	2	3	4
(12)	This year I have seen others using the communication skills that were emphasized in last year's (1972-73) HRP.	1	2	3	4
(13)	I am interested in participating in more human relations programs.	1	2	3	4
(14)	The members of my school or project developed more positive working relationships as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4
(15)	I feel better able to relate to persons of different races as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4
(16)	I am more aware of the values and outlooks of cultural and racial groups other than my own as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4
(17)	I feel better able to deal with sexism as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4
(18)	I feel better able to deal with people of different life styles and values as a result of the HRP.	1	2	3	4

What are your perceptions of the amount of involvement by each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program.

	None	Some	Much	Tremendous	Don't Know
(19) Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
(20) Clerks	1	2	3	4	5
(21) Custodians	1	2	3	4	5
(22) Teachers and Certificated Support	1	2	3	4	5
(23) Administrators	1	2	3	4	5
(24) Teacher Aides	1	2	3	4	5
(25) Students	1	2	3	4	5
(26) Community	1	2	3	4	5

(27) How often this year, in addition to the minimum five Tuesdays, have you participated in planned human relations activities with the staff at your school?

_____1. Ten times or more

_____2. 5 - 9 times

_____3. 1 - 4 times

_____4. Never

Give examples_____

(28) Has the Tuesday emphasis on human relations transferred to your school environment or to your work as an individual?

_____1. Yes, a lot of transfer

_____2. Yes, some transfer

_____3. No

If Yes, please indicate how_____

How do you view the interpersonal relationships among the various members of your school setting? Under each of the five relationships specified below, five pairs of adjectives are used to describe the quality of the relationship. Indicate how you feel about each of the relationships by circling one of the five numbers on each of the lines. For example, if you feel that a particular relationship is more friendly than unfriendly, circle 1 or 2; if you feel the relationship is more unfriendly than friendly, circle 4 or 5; if your feelings are neutral, circle 3. If you do not feel that you can make a judgment, do not circle any number on the line. Your answers should indicate how you perceive the relationships of all members in the specified relationship, not just how you as an individual may fit into the relationship.

THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ALL STAFF MEMBERS ARE

(29) Friendly 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Unfriendly

(30) Sensitive 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Insensitive

(31) Closed 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Open

(32) Trustful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Distrustful

(33) Cold 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Warm

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ALL STAFF MEMBERS AND ALL STUDENTS ARE

(34) Friendly 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Unfriendly

(35) Sensitive 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Insensitive

(36) Closed 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Open

(37) Trustful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Distrustful

(38) Cold 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Warm

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STAFF MEMBERS OF DIFFERENT RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS ARE

(39) Friendly 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Unfriendly

(40) Sensitive 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Insensitive

(41) Closed 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Open

(42) Trustful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Distrustful

(43) Cold 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Warm

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STAFF MEMBERS AND STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS ARE

(44) Friendly 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Unfriendly

(45) Sensitive 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Insensitive

(46) Closed 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Open

(47) Trustful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Distrustful

(48) Cold 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Warm

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS ARE

(49) Friendly 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Unfriendly

(50) Sensitive 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Insensitive

(51) Closed 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Open

(52) Trustful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Distrustful

(53) Cold 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Warm

(54) Overall, what impact did the human relations activities have on interpersonal relations in your school or project.

_____1. Improved greatly

_____2. Improved some

_____3. Did not change

_____4. Became worse

_____5. No improvement was needed

(55) All in all, how worthwhile were the human relations activities to you?

_____1. Very worthwhile

_____2. Worthwhile

_____3. Not very worthwhile

_____4. Worthless

(56) Which aspects of the Human Relations Program were most valuable to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(57) Which aspects of the Human Relations Program were least valuable to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(58) What is your position?

_____1. Clerical or custodial staff

_____2. Teacher, administrator or other certificated staff

_____3. Parent or community

_____4. Teacher aide

_____5. Other (specify)_____

(59) In human relations programs it is important to know how people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds view the program. Please indicate your racial/ethnic background below. Responses by racial/ethnic background will be reported by total city and area only. Feel free to leave this item blank if you wish.

_____1. Black American

_____2. Indian American

_____3. White American

_____4. Other racial/ethnic group

Research and Evaluation Department
March 1974

Minneapolis Public Schools

Educational Services Division

Research and Evaluation Department

Harry N. Vakos, PhD., Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Richard W. Faunce, PhD., Director of Research and Evaluation

Lary R. Johnson, Research Assistant

Bonna Nesset, Administrative Assistant